

Detecting dense communities in large social and information networks with the Core & Peel algorithm

Marco Pellegrini
Institute for Informatics and
Telematics
Consiglio Nazionale delle
Ricerche
Via Moruzzi 1, 56124 Pisa,
Italy
m.pellegrini@iit.cnr.it

Filippo Geraci
Institute for Informatics and
Telematics
Consiglio Nazionale delle
Ricerche
Via Moruzzi 1, 56124 Pisa,
Italy
f.geraci@iit.cnr.it

Miriam Baglioni
Institute for Informatics and
Telematics
Consiglio Nazionale delle
Ricerche
Via Moruzzi 1, 56124 Pisa,
Italy
m.baglioni@iit.cnr.it

ABSTRACT

Detecting and characterizing dense subgraphs (tight communities) in social and information networks is an important exploratory tool in social network analysis. Several approaches have been proposed that either (i) partition the whole network into "clusters", even in low density region, or (ii) are aimed at finding a single densest community (and need to be iterated to find the next one). As social networks grow larger both approaches (i) and (ii) result in algorithms too slow to be practical, in particular when speed in analyzing the data is required. In this paper we propose an approach that aims at balancing efficiency of computation and expressiveness/manageability of the output community representation. We define the notion of a partial dense cover (PDC) of a graph. Intuitively a PDC of a graph is a collection of sets of nodes that (a) each set forms a disjoint dense induced subgraphs and (b) its removal leaves the residual graph without dense regions. Exact computation of PDC is an NP-complete problem, thus, we propose an efficient heuristic algorithms for computing a PDC which we christen *Core & Peel*. Moreover we propose a novel benchmarking technique that allows us to evaluate algorithms for computing PDC using the classical IR concepts of precision and recall even without a golden standard. Tests on 25 social and technological networks from the Stanford Large Network Dataset Collection confirm that Core & Peel is efficient and attains very high precision and recall.

1. INTRODUCTION

Finding dense sub-networks in complex (social, communication, technological, biological) networks is a key exploratory tool in complex network analysis as often one can spot emerging phenomena linked to these regions with an above-average level of activity. As we will use social networks as a key metaphor we will talk of dense *communities* of nodes.

A brief taxonomy of approaches to community detection. The recent literature the detection of community structures in complex graphs can be roughly split into three trends.

The first approach has concentrated on *partitioning* the nodes of a graph into clusters (or modules) so to favor the formation of modules for which intra-modules connections are favored over inter-module connections (e.g. the classical algorithm of Girvan and Newman [19]). This approach uses a non-local definition of "density" and postulates that every node should belong to some community (or alternatively) that all communities even if a low density or hard to distinguish from the background are of interest (approach A). Being a partition of the nodes, the communities found are disjoint.

The second approach postulates that a connected community maximizing the density should be sought [3, 8]. A collection of dense communities can be constructed by removing the community found from the input graph and iterating the method on the residual graph (approach B). Communities found in this way are disjoint.

A third approach aims at enumerating all dense subgraphs within the graph, usually with a condition of maximality, but allowing overlaps among communities (see e.g. PalE-tA105)(approach C). In the worst case, the size of the output of an algorithm listing all maximal cliques (or maximal dense subgraphs) can be exponentially larger than the size of the input.

Any of the aforementioned approaches has its pros and cons. Very Large social networks currently available pose a challenge to community analysis approaches in terms of computation time, main memory storage and readability of the algorithms' results.

So while approaches (A) and (C) may reveal a complex community landscape, they do so in a quite unfocussed manner, that implies slow computations, and/or high memory consumption, and an output that may need further analysis/modelling/visualization to be of use. In contrast approach (B) may be fast if appropriate heuristics are employed, but reveals only a single community in an otherwise more complex landscape. A the simple solution consisting in iterating approach (B) over the residual graph obtained by removing the found densest community would be an over-shooting for this problem, taking us back to the problem of an excessive time complexity.

The fourth approach, which is advocated in this paper as well as in others (see e.g. [28], [12], [18] [9], [36]) is that of collecting in one go a collection of disjoint dense communities above a certain size and density thresholds. This approach is suitable for very large graphs since the output is easy to interpret, visualize, and feed to further filters and analytic tools, in particular it is often the method of choice for the web graphs because of their size.

Our contribution. This paper presents two main contributions. The first is a formalization of the problem of (disjoint) communities detection as that of computing a *partial dense cover of a graph* and an efficient algorithm (christened *Core & Peel*) for computing heuristically the partial dense covers of a graph. The second contribution is methodological and aims at improving our capability of measuring the quality of an heuristic algorithms for (disjoint) community detection. In particular we propose a scheme that allow us to measure performance by classical IR concepts of *precision* and *recall* or realistic (i.e. non-random) graphs even without using a golden standard.

The Core & Peel algorithm. We present an heuristic algorithm for detecting all sufficiently dense subgraphs of a graph G whose removal produces a residual graph G' without dense subgraphs. The main idea consists in visiting the nodes of a graph in an appropriate order and for each visited node (called a seed) we look in the neighborhood of the seed in order to isolate those nodes in the neighborhood that, together with the seed, can participate in an a sufficiently dense induced subgraph. The order of the visit of the node is chosen so to visit first those nodes more likely to contribute in a larger dense subgraph. Large and dense subgraph must be detected only once so to avoid wasting time re-discovering the same subgraph multiple times (i.e. with a single seed) thus once such dense subgraph is detected its component vertices are marked and cannot be used as seeds any more. The visit order is produced by computing first the *core number* of each node in the graph, which represent an upper bound to the average degree of the largest clique (or quasi-clique) incident to a node. Once a suitable region around a seed is detected that is likely to hold a dense subgraph, we employ a variant of the *peeling* procedure described by Charikar in [8] to extract the dense subgraph. The key definitions and the algorithm is described in 4.

Benchmarking methodology. In many areas of computer science the lack of a common benchmarking methodology is often recognized as one of the main obstacles towards speedy progress in solving the key problems of that area. The IR community has been one of the first success stories in setting up an effective benchmarking methodology codified through the TREC conference series. For the problem of clique detection the TCS and OR communities established the DIMACS benchmark collection. While many methods for community detection have been proposed recently, there is still no accepted benchmarking methodology. Most papers address the issue of algorithmic validation by planting a few dense subgraph in a random graph and comparing the predicted dense subgraph against the planted ones. This "standard" approach is however wanting in many respects.

(a) First of all it is well known that the basic Erdős-Rényi random graph model is not suitable for modelling complex (social, technological, etc..) networks, while on the other hand it is still an open area of research that of producing suitable generative graph models. At the moment no single

model can cover the whole range of applications.

(b) Secondly, the embedded communities should not skew too much the underlying graph distribution (e.g. the vertex degree distribution) so to avoid making the instances amenable to approach based on simple statistical filters.

(c) Thirdly, the possible presence of native (non-planted) dense subgraphs complicates the assessment as any method since detecting such nodes cannot be considered a fault of the algorithm, and should be weighted positively rather than ignored.

In section 5 we propose a method that copes with issues (a),(b) and (c) and results in a more stringent and realistic assessment for community detection algorithms. In particular we are able to define both precision and recall measurements that are standard and well understood measures of quality in IR applications.

2. PREVIOUS WORK

Most of the known results are for finding a single maximum size dense subgraph (or clique). In [29] V.E. Lee et al. give a survey of the state of the art on algorithms for dense subgraph discovery. Here we recall the main known results.

Densest subgraph detection. Dense subgraphs can be defined in a variety of ways: if we seek the subgraph H of G maximizing the average degree $2|E(H)|/|V(H)|$, then there is an exact polynomial algorithm based on max-flow/min-cut computations [16, 20]. A second exact polynomial time algorithm based on a reduction to LP is shown in [8]. A simple greedy (1/2)-approximation algorithm¹ is also shown in [8].

If we look for the densest subgraph with exactly k -vertices (**dks**), which is an NP-complete problem, Feige et al. [14] gave an $O(n^{-1/3+\epsilon})$ -approximation algorithm, where $n = |V|$, and $\epsilon > 0$ an arbitrarily small positive constant. The approximation coefficient has been later improved in [6] to $O(n^{-1/4+\epsilon})$. It is known that this problem does not admit a PTAS, unless some hard complexity hypothesis holds [25].

If we look for the densest subgraph with *at least* k -vertices (**dalks**) Andersen et al. [3] give an efficient (1/3)-approximation algorithm for this problem, based on core decomposition. In the same paper it is shown that the densest *at most* k problem (**dalks**) is as hard as **dks**. Somewhat more complex (still polynomial) algorithms (based on LP and/or max-flow) attain an approximation factor of 1/2 for **dalks** [2, 26].

A different notion of "density" is used in the definition of γ -quasi cliques. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a γ -quasi clique if every node in G is adjacent to at least $\gamma(|V| - 1)$ nodes in G . The densest subgraph problem (with this notion of density) can be recast as the problem of finding the largest induced subgraph that is a γ -quasi clique, for a fixed value of γ . Heuristics for detecting quasi-cliques are developed in [30, 1]. A method for detecting quasi-cliques tailored for external memory computations is given in [38]. Since, for $\gamma = 1$ we obtain a clique, this problem is in general as hard as maximum clique detection.

¹A ρ -approximation algorithm A for a *maximization problem*, with $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ is an algorithm that, calling OPT the value of the objective function $f(\cdot) \geq 0$ for the optimal solution, returns a solution x , whose value of the objective function $f(x)$ is such that $\rho OPT \leq f(x) \leq OPT$.

When the subgraph sought are relatively large and dense, a sampling approach based on shingling by Gibson et al. [18] works well in practice.

In [37] Wang et al. define dense subgraph by placing a lower bound on the number of common neighbors for each pair of adjacent nodes in the subgraph, and propose a method based on iterating an efficient triangle counting black-box algorithm.

Maximum clique. The maximum clique problem for a graph G requires to find the the largest complete subgraph of G , and is a classical NP-complete problem. Since this problem is also hard to approximate [23] the research effort has been directed towards heuristic, or exact algorithms still exponential in the worst case, but able to be fast in practice over certain classes of input graphs (see [7] for a survey).

Other graphs. In this paper we restrict ourselves to generic (undirected) graphs. There is also a vast literature which we do not touch here (and corresponding different definitions) for directed graphs, for bipartite graphs, and other generalizations or specializations of graphs.

Dense subgraphs and communities in social networks. In social graphs often communities are defined in terms of dense subgraphs (see [15, 19, 33, 27]). Also dense bipartite subgraphs are important in some applications since web communities are often modeled as bipartite subgraphs of hubs and authorities (see e.g. [28, 12]).

Partial dense covers approaches. A work that has similar aims as ours is in [9], where a partial vertex cover with dense subgraphs is sought. In [36] wang et al. map the problem into a real geometric space and look for dense clusters of points in this space.

Core Decomposition. Since we use heavily properties of the *core decomposition* of a graph, we survey some related results. The k -core of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is defined in [34] as an induced subgraph H of G , of minimum degree at least k . The core number of a vertex v of G is the order of the largest k -core to which v belongs. The core decomposition of a graph is a partition of the nodes into equivalence classes by the core number of its vertices. The core number $cn(G)$ of a graph is the maximum core number of any vertex in v .

A very efficient method (linear in the graph size $O(|V| + |E|)$) for computing the core decomposition of a graph was proposed in [5]. For a graph too large to fit in RAM memory a method in [10] allows to compute the core decomposition of a graph with $O(cn(G))$ scans of the data. Several applications of core decomposition to the analysis of networks are listed in [10].

The core decomposition is used as a preliminary phase in the approximate algorithms in [3] for the densest at-least- k subgraph problem (dalk).

3. PRELIMINARIES

Let $G = (V, E \subset V \times V)$ be a simple (undirected) graph (no self-loops, no multiple edges).

A subset $Q \subset V$ induces a subgraph $H_Q = (Q, E_Q)$, where $E_Q = \{(a, b) \in E | a \in Q \wedge b \in Q\}$.

A nice survey of concepts and algorithms related to local density of subgraphs is in [27]. We restrict ourselves to local density definitions, that are those for which the density of a subset Q is a function depending on Q only and E_Q .

For a graph G is *average degree* is:

$$av(G) = \frac{2|E|}{|V|},$$

thus the ratio $|E|/|V|$ is just half the average degree. Define as *density* of a graph $D(G)$ the following ratio:

$$D(G) = \frac{|E|}{\binom{|V|}{2}} = \frac{2|E|}{|V|(|V| - 1)},$$

which gives the ratio of the number of edges in G to the maximum possible number of edges in a complete graph with the same number of nodes.

Cliques are subgraphs of density 1, and finding a maximum induced clique in a graph G is an NP-complete problem. Several relaxations of the notion of clique have been proposed (see [4]) for a survey), most of which also lead to NP-complete decision problems.

In the data mining literature it has emerged the concept of quasi-clique. Given a parameter $\gamma \in [0..1]$, a γ -quasi clique is a graph $G = (V, E)$ such that:

$$\forall v \in V \quad |N_G(v)| \geq \gamma(|V| - 1),$$

where $N(G(v)) = \{u \in V | (v, u) \in E\}$ is the set of neighbors of v in G .

Note that a γ -quasi clique has density $D(G) \geq \gamma$. In general however for a dense graph with density $D(G)$ we cannot infer a bound on the value of γ for which it is a quasi-clique (except for the value $D(G) = 1$ that implies $\gamma = 1$, and those cases covered by Tur'an's and Dirac's theorems ([35, 11]).

If we impose a lower bound to the number of nodes k of vertices in a subgraph, then the average degree and the density depend only on the number of edges, and the attain maximum value for the same graph. Otherwise finding the subgraph of maximum average degree, or the subgraph of maximum density are quite different problems, the latter admitting a polynomial time solution, the latter NP-complete. In this paper we aim at detecting dense-subgraphs with a lower bounds on the size of the graph and to its density. However the heuristic we propose is best understood by referring to the case of cliques and quasi-cliques. Isolated cliques and quasi-cliques have a regular structure for which it is easy to derive useful properties. When we look at the induced cliques and induced quasi-cliques in a graph, we cannot guarantee that those properties are preserved, although they are in general rather robust with respect to the perturbations produced by the other nodes, and thus are often preserved in real-life social graphs.

4. HEURISTIC FOR DENSE COVER

4.1 Partial dense cover of a graph

In this paper we propose an alternative approach that aims at balancing efficiency of computation and expressiveness/manageability of the output community representation. Our aim is to compute for a graph $G = (V, E)$ and parameters $q \in [1, ..|V|]$ and density parameter $\delta \in [0.0, ..1.0]$, a *partial dense cover* $PDC(G)$ of G . We denote by $D[G]$ the density of G , i.e the ratio of $|E|$ and $|V|(|V| - 1)/2$.

A partial dense cover $PDG(G)$ is a collection of subsets of V , $\{C_1, ..., C_k\}$. With the following properties

- a $\forall j \in [1..k], C_j \subseteq V$
- b *Node-disjointness*: $\forall j, h \in [1..k], j \neq h \Rightarrow C_j \cap C_h = \emptyset$.
- c *Large size and density*. $\forall j \in [1..k], |C_j| \geq q$, and $\forall j \in [1..k], D[G[C_j]] \geq \delta$.
- d *Internal maximality*: The union of any two sets C_i , and C_j induces a subgraph satisfying the other conditions and of density lower than the minimum density of $G[C_i]$ and $G[C_j]$.
- e *External maximality*: The residual graph $G[V \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i]$ does not contain any induced subgraph satisfying the other conditions.
- f *Radius constraint*: Each subgraph $G[C_i]$ has radius 1 or 2.

The best way to justify the notion of a partial dense cover is to consider it as a relaxation of the well known concept of a *minimum clique partition* (problem GT15 in [17]). A minimum clique partition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a partition of the vertex set V into k disjoint subsets so that the graph induced in G by each subset is a clique. Computing a clique cover of minimum size (k) is a well known NP-complete problem [17], and it is hard to approximate [31].

In a clique cover every clique satisfies the radius constraint (f), as any clique has radius 1, however graphs of radius 1 are not cliques in general. The radius constraint to 1 or 2 is set in order to attain an efficient computation, but as we will see later, we will be able to cover a wide range of non-trivial communities.

The cover we seek is *partial* since we do not insist that any vertex must belong to some covering set, however we ask in (e) that the residual graph must not contain a subgraph that may be part of the cover. Note that this condition (d) implies that the problem we define is still NP-hard. In particular, for the density parameter $\delta = 1.0$, our problem reduces to assessing whether a graph contains no clique of size at least q , which is equivalent to the NP-complete maximum clique problem.

The internal maximality constraint (d) is not problematic from a computational point of view since it can always be enforced "a posteriori" in polynomial time starting from a cover that satisfies the other constraints.

For $\delta = 1.0$ and $q = 1$ the problem is reduced to that of computing a *minimal clique cover*, that is, a clique cover which cannot be improved by locally merge two sets in the cover. This extreme case can be solved polynomially, but, naturally it is different from the minimum cover problem.

The size parameter q and density parameter δ ensure that we can focus the computational effort towards those part of the graph that are more interesting (i.e. of large size and high density) with the aim of attaining computational efficiency and controlling the amount of information gathered in a run of the algorithm.

4.2 An Algorithm to compute partial dense covers

As noted above computing a partial dense cover PDC(G) of a graph is an NP complete problem. In this section we will give an efficient heuristic algorithm which is based on combining in a novel way several algorithms and procedure

already present separately in literature. For each step we will give "hand weaving" arguments as to its role and an intuitive reason as to why it contributes to solving the PDC(G) computation efficiently.

4.3 Heuristic Algorithm Core & Peel

Phase I. Initially we compute the Core Decomposition of G (denoted with $CD(G)$). Moreover we compute for each vertex v in G the *Core Count* of v , denoted with $CC(v)$, defined as the number of neighbors of v having core number at least as large as $C(v)$. Next, we sort the vertices of V in decreasing lexicographic order of their core values $C(v)$ and core count value $CC(v)$.

Phase II. In phase II we consider each node v in turn, in the order given by phase I. For each v we construct the set $N_{C(v)}^r(v)$ of neighbors of v at distance r in G having core number at least $C(v)$. If $|N_{C(v)}^r(v)| < q$ we do not process this node any more. Otherwise we compute the density $\delta(v)$ of the induced subgraph $G[N_{C(v)}^r(v)]$. If this density is too small: $\delta(v) \leq \delta_{low}$, for a user defined threshold δ_{low} we do not process this node any more. Nodes that pass the size and density tests go to phase III.

Phase III. In this phase we take v and the induced subgraph $G[N_{C(v)}^r(v)]$ and we apply a variant of the peeling procedure described in [8], that iteratively removes nodes of minimum degree in the graph. The peeling procedure stops (and report failure) when the number of nodes drops below the threshold q . The peeling procedure stops (and reports success) when the density of the resulting subgraph is above or equal to the user defined threshold δ . The set of nodes returned by the successful peeling procedure is added to the output cover set, and its elements are marked so to be excluded from further consideration.

Phases II and III are executed interleaved so to (1) enforce that the covering sets produced are disjoint, and (2) avoid discovering multiple times the same dense subgraph.

4.4 Justifications of phase I

The core decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ associates to any vertex v a number $C(v)$ which is the largest number such that v has at least $C(v)$ neighbors having core number at least $C(v)$.

Consider now a clique K_x of size x , for each node v in K_x its core number is $x - 1$. If K_x is an induced subgraph of G , then its core number can only be larger than $x - 1$, thus $C(v)$ is an upper bound to the size of the largest induced clique incident to v .

Consider a quasi-clique $K_{x,\gamma}$, for each node v in $K_{x,\gamma}$ its core number is at least $\gamma(x - 1)$. If $K_{x,\gamma}$ is an induced subgraph of G , then its core number can only be larger, thus $C(v)$ is an upper bound to the size of the largest (in terms of average degree) quasi-clique incident to v .

Thus if the upper bound provided by the core number is tight, examining the nodes in (decreasing) order of their core number allows us to home in first on the largest cliques (or quasi-cliques), and subsequently the smaller ones.

In a clique K_x each node is a *leader* for the clique, meaning that it is at distance 1 to any other node in the clique. Thus the first node of K_x encountered in the order computed in phase I is always a leader. In the case of quasi-cliques we just suppose the existence of at least one leader node. For an isolated quasi-clique the leader node will have the the maximum possible core count value, thus by sorting (in

the lexicographic order) on the core count value we push the leader node to be discovered first in the order (assuming all nodes in the quasi-clique have the same core number). For an induced quasi-clique the influence of other nodes may increase the value of the core count for any node, but, assuming that the relative order between the leader and the other nodes does not change, we still obtain the effect of encountering the leader before the other nodes of the quasi-clique.

The core number gives us an estimate of the largest (in terms of average degree) quasi-clique (or clique) a node can be incident to, thus it provides a very powerful filter. Also fortunately there is a very efficient algorithm of complexity $O(|V| + |E|)$ that computes the core decomposition of a graph [5].

Also it has been observed empirically that in social graph often the core number and the core count of any node are much smaller than its degree (which is also an obvious upper bound on the size of the largest clique incident to v). Thus subsequent operations are intuitively less expensive when their complexity can be charged onto the core number or the core count values of a node and its neighbors.

4.5 Justification of phase II

In Phase II we count the number of edges in the subgraph induced by the node v and its neighbours with equal or higher core value. Phase II is equivalent to computing a *restricted local clustering coefficient* of a node v , where the computation is restricted to the neighboring nodes of v of sufficiently high core number.

Classical result of Turan and Dirac (see [35], [11]) guarantee the existence of a clique (or a clique with a few edges missing) in graphs with sufficiently many edges. (approximately above $n^2/4$ for a graph of n nodes). Although it is possible to derive some thresholds from these classical results, such threshold would give us only sufficient conditions but not necessary ones to the existence of a clique in the graph that is examined in phase II. Since the purpose of phase II is to trade off the number of invocations of phase III with the chance that phase III may find a sufficiently dense subgraph, we resort to a more ad-hoc strategy for selecting thresholds. We set $\delta_{low} = \delta/2$, which did perform well in our experiments.

4.6 Justification of phase III

The peeling procedure we use is similar to one described in [8]. It consists in an iterative procedure that remove a node of minimum degree (ties resolved arbitrarily) and all incident edges, then iterates on the residual graph. In [8] the graph of highest average degree constructed in this process is returned as output. We modify this procedure by returning the first subgraph generated that satisfies the density and size constraints.

It is shown in [8] that this procedure is $(1/2)$ -approximate for the *average degree*, i.e. it returns a subgraph whose average degree is with a factor $(1/2)$ of that of the subgraph of highest average degree. Empirically, we rely on the intuition that, in our setting, the input to the peeling procedure as produced after phase II is a superset of the output that is tight enough and dense enough so that the peeling procedure converges quickly to isolating the embedded dense subgraph, in a typical situation.

We also use a novel heuristic to solve cases of ties within the peeling algorithm in [8]. When two or more vertices are of minimum degree the original peeling procedure picks one arbitrarily. In our variant we compute the sum of degrees of the adjacent nodes $D(v) = \sum_{w \in N(v)} d(w)$ and we select the vertex among those of minimum degree minimizing $D(\cdot)$. This secondary selection criterion is inspired by observations in [22], where the objective is to select an independent set by iteratively removing small degree nodes, which is a dual problem that of detecting cliques.

4.7 Influence of radii

In our algorithm we assume that the dense community has radius $r = 1$ or $r = 2$. This technical restriction is needed in order to ensure that we can recover efficiently a superset of the community node set starting from a leader seed node. As we will argue below this restriction is not severe as it covers a wide range of cases of interest either precisely or with high probability.

Case $r = 1$. As mentioned above in a clique K_n of n nodes every node is at distance 1 from any other node, thus every node is a center and the radius is $r = 1$. If we start removing edges from K_n we maintain the property $r = 1$ with certainty up to $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1$ edge removals, while the number of centers is reduced. If we look at the edge removal as a random uniform selection of a pair of nodes and we remove of the edge joining them (if still existing) we can model this process similarly to the well known *Coupon collector problem* [32] thus the expected number of edge deletions before all nodes are selected at least once is approximately $(n/2) \ln n$. Thus even for a fair relaxation from the clique we retain the property with high probability of to this limit since the Coupon Collector number has a distribution highly concentrated around the expected value.

In certain applications a node that represents a center (realizes $r = 1$) in a dense subgraph can be interpreted as a "leader" of the group (since it has relationships with all the members of the group) and thus being a feature characterizing the proper communities. In effect in many social graphs (e.g. Twitter graph) there is a natural leader-follower dynamics.

Case $r = 2$. If we remove edges but the degree of each node is at least $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ then by the pigeon hole principle each pair of nodes in the community will have a neighbor in common, thus the radius of the subgraph is 2 and every node is a center (with $r = 2$). Thus the algorithm set with parameters $r = 2$ is (potentially) able to recover in phase I a superset of any γ -quasi clique for $\gamma \geq 0.5$.

Consider the following random process. We take a set V of n vertices, for each $v \in V$ we select its neighbor vertex set by picking vertices in V with probability p . The property that any two nodes have a non-empty neighbor intersection can be rephrased as the requirement that the corresponding *intersection graph* (see [24]) is complete. The threshold value of p so that this property holds with high probability is

$$p = \sqrt{\frac{2 \log n}{n}}$$

Since the expected number of neighbors of any node v is pn , we have that the graph is an $O(p)$ -quasi clique with high probability. Thus we are able to retain the property $r = 2$ and the fact that all nodes are centers ever at a quite

low overall density.

5. TESTING EFFECTIVENESS

5.1 Testing methodology

The quality of the heuristic proposed will be tested empirically by the planted solution methodology [13]. For a given input graph G and parameters δ , and q we implant randomly a certain number of subgraphs in G , by adding edges, so to force the presence of a subgraph of size $\bar{q} \geq q$ and density $\bar{\delta} \geq \delta$. We call this graph G' the *planted graph*.

By measuring the number of such planted subgraphs that are found by running $H - PDG$ blindly on the planted graph we can measure the effectiveness of $H - PDG$ in finding such structures. In IR terms we can thus measure the recall of the method. Experiments on 12 data sets (not shown in this paper) indicate that using this simple methodology the performance is close to 100% in terms of recall for planted cliques of size equal to the average degree of the graph G . This methodology was adopted in [12].

In order to better assess the potential of the method however we resort to a more taxing testing methodology. In particular we want to measure not only the algorithm's capability of detecting planted dense subgraph, but also the property that no dense subgraphs are left in the residual graph after the application of the algorithm.

Thus we operate as follows. We take the input graph G and we apply the $H - PDG$ algorithm, thus obtaining a set of dense subgraphs and a residual graph G_1 . We then apply a second time $H - PDG$ to G_1 possibly obtaining a few more communities and a second residual graph G_2 . Next we plant dense subgraphs in G_2 obtaining the planted graph G'_2 , and we run $H - PDG$ on G'_2 . In the ideal case G_2 , being a residual graph after two applications of $H - PDG$ is already empty of dense subgraphs, thus the all and only communities we should find are those we planed in G'_2 . Now we can define properly the notion of *precision* and *recall* of the algorithm. Each planted community that is not found reduces the recall, while each found community that was not planted reduces the precision. We can obviously also define the harmonic mean of the two measures that is known as F-measure which gives us a more synthetic measurement.

Note that we apply $H - PDG$ twice before generating the planting graph on which we measure precision and recall. In general one can try to increase the precision by iterating several time $H - PDG$ on the residual graph resulting from the previous iteration. We chose to limit the iterations to a fixed and small number (two) for two orders of reasons, the first one is that the cost of the execution in terms of time increases². The second and more important one is that even with two applications the precision already reaches values close to 1, while further iteration have no direct impact on the recall, thus the F-measure would not be much affected by further iterations.

Choice of parameters.

The choice of size and density of the planted communities is critical. If we plant communities too large and dense the degree of the selected nodes will be biased and even a simple

²This marginal cost could be kept under control by doing incremental updates of the data structures, rather than a re-computation from scratch and by examining only the nodes whose immediate neighborhood has been affected by the updates.

minded approach can easily detect the nodes belonging to these communities. We choose the planted communities so that their average degree is equal to the half the average degree of the host graph (i.e roughly $|E|/|V|$). Moreover we choose the number of planted communities so to modify no more than 1% of the total number of nodes.

The searching algorithm is given as parameters (minimum size, density) exactly the parameters used for the planting of the communities. The list of detected communities is matched with the list of embedded communities, and a planted community is marked as "detected" if its vertex set overlaps by more than 50% with a detected community. Precision and recall are computed with respect to the communities (not their node-sets).

Note that one could improve the recall "by default" by performing the search with parameters of minimum size and minimum density slightly lower than those used for the generation. In this case we are less likely to miss embedded nodes, and the embedded community would be a subset of a larger detected community without incurring in any penalty. In order to make a fair assessment of the proposed algorithm we will not use this option. In general, however, such strategy is beneficial when one sees $H - PDG$ as a filter to be used to feed candidate communities (of much smaller size w.r.t the original graph G) to exact but computationally expensive methods, such as for example methods based on ILP developed in [4].

Other testing methodologies. In [9] the evaluation of the accuracy is done, for the case of non bipartite graphs, by generating random graphs with 100 nodes and 2000 edges that contains three dense subgraphs which cover 75% of the nodes of the graph. Precision and recall are computed with respect to the node-sets and the F-values obtained are close to 1.

In [36] the evaluation of the accuracy is done by embedding four dense subgraphs (with 8 nodes each and density 70%) in a random sparser graph of total of 60 nodes. Also, in this case the planted communities cover more than 50% of the nodes of the graph. In [36] it is shown that all four dense subgraphs are detected using the CSV-plot.

Although the results shown in [9, 36] are quite good for small random graphs with high community coverage, it is not clear if measurements obtained allows to infer similar performance in social graphs whose size, degree distribution and community structure are so different.

For this reasons we decided to develop a new, more demanding, testing methodology, which is closer to the applicative scenarios where the targets are social and technological graphs.

5.2 Benchmark data set

The experiments are conducted on 25 graphs downloaded from the Stanford Large Network Dataset Collection [21]. This collection comprises several graph types including: Internet autonomous systems, Authors collaboration networks, Internet peer-to-peer networks, E-mail communication networks, Citation networks, Web graphs, Trust networks, Road networks, and Product co-purchasing networks. Basic graph statistics are shown in Table 3, other measures are available at [21].

5.3 Experiments

In Tables 1 and 2 we report average precision, average recall and average F-measure over all 25 data sets, for density ranging from 100% to 50% and radius ranging from 1 to 2.

Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 report the precision, recall and fmeasure of the method on each test file for varying radius and density values.

In the first set of experiment we embed cliques (100% dense, radius 1) of size roughly $|E|/|V|$, data are reported in Table 4. Note that the recall is always quite high; it is above 90% in all 25 cases. Precision is slightly worse (above 90% in 22 cases out of 25). The combination though the F-measure however is above 90% in 23 cases out of 25, and never below 0.85. On average, precision is about 96% and recall about 99%. When we keep the radius to 1, but we reduce the density to 70% (see 5), there is a reduction in precision and recall, with recall above 90% in 11 tests, precision above 90% in 12 tests, with average precision about 83% and average recall about 84%. When we relax the radius constraint to radius=2 at 70% density, 14 test cases attain precision above 90%, 10 recall above 90%, and 8 F-measure above 90%, however while the average recall reduces to 78%, the average precision is maintained at 85%. Finally when we leave the radius to 2 and set the density to 50% we have very similar values for average precision and average recall. Thus, we conclude that the computation at radius 2 is not so sensitive to the density threshold.

Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 report on the time measurement on each test file, with data for each phase, for the total time spent, and the time spent per edge. The initial phase that consists in the core decomposition is linear in the size of the graph, while all other computations involve the local neighborhood of some node, thus it is interesting to measure the time spent per edge as a common criterion of comparison for different runs of the algorithm. One can observe that the time spend for edge is rather stable, in the region of 10^{-6} to 10^{-5} seconds for radius =1 (Tables 8, 9) and in the range 10^{-4} to 10^{-3} seconds for radius=2 (Tables 10, 11). Some slower runs for radius=1 are noticeable for some of the web-graphs (files 23, and 25). In the total time we include the cost of run 3 whose purpose is to measure the effectiveness of runs 1 and 2, thus, if this reliability measure is not needed, it can be skipped and the total time reduced by about 1/3. Since the experimental code has been developed in Python we expect that a factor 10 in timing can be easily gained by switching to an implementation in the C language.

measure	radius	density	value
average precision	d=1	1.0	0.95429535884
average recall	d=1	1.0	0.98965535788
average fmeasure	d=1	1.0	0.97020508204
average precision	d=1	0.7	0.83020137232
average recall	d=1	0.7	0.83947183728
average fmeasure	d=1	0.7	0.82681618136

Table 1: Averages output quality statistics for radius 1.

6. CONCLUSIONS

measure	radius	density	value
average precision	d=2	0.7	0.8557872834
average recall	d=2	0.7	0.780538866
average fmeasure	d=2	0.7	0.78194706944
average precision	d=2	0.5	0.77783144912
average recall	d=2	0.5	0.82669275188
average fmeasure	d=2	0.5	0.78456921128

Table 2: Averages output quality statistics for radius 2.

In this paper we have presented a method to quickly find dense sub-graphs (communities) in graphs. The novelty of the approach relies on the combination of existing methods to speed up the community discovery. The experiments conducted on various types of graphs show the effectiveness and the reliability of the method.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] J. Abello, M. G. C. Resende, and S. Sudarsky. Massive quasi-clique detection. In S. Rajsbaum, editor, *LATIN*, volume 2286 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 598–612. Springer, 2002.
- [2] R. Andersen. Finding large and small dense subgraphs. *CoRR*, abs/cs/0702032, 2007.
- [3] R. Andersen and K. Chellapilla. Finding dense subgraphs with size bounds. In K. Avrachenkov, D. Donato, and N. Litvak, editors, *WAW*, volume 5427 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 25–37. Springer, 2009.
- [4] B. Balasundaram. *Graph Theoretic Generalizations Of Clique: Optimization And Extensions*. PhD thesis, Texas A&M University, 2007.
- [5] V. Batagelj and M. Zaversnik. An $O(m)$ algorithm for cores decomposition of networks. *CoRR*, cs.DS/0310049, 2003.
- [6] A. Bhaskara, M. Charikar, E. Chlamtac, U. Feige, and A. Vijayaraghavan. Detecting high log-densities: an $o(n^{1/4})$ approximation for densest k -subgraph. In L. J. Schulman, editor, *STOC*, pages 201–210. ACM, 2010.
- [7] I. M. Bomze, M. Budinich, P. M. Pardalos, and M. Pelillo. The maximum clique problem. In *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 1–74. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.
- [8] M. Charikar. Greedy approximation algorithms for finding dense components in a graph. In K. Jansen and S. Khuller, editors, *APPROX*, volume 1913 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 84–95. Springer, 2000.
- [9] J. Chen and Y. Saad. Dense subgraph extraction with application to community detection. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 24(7), 2012.
- [10] J. Cheng, Y. Ke, S. Chu, and M. T. Özsu. Efficient core decomposition in massive networks. In S. Abiteboul, K. Böhm, C. Koch, and K.-L. Tan, editors, *ICDE*, pages 51–62. IEEE Computer Society, 2011.

- [11] G. A. Dirac. Extensions of turán theorem on graphs. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 14:417–422, 1963.
- [12] Y. Dourisboure, F. Geraci, and M. Pellegrini. Extraction and classification of dense implicit communities in the web graph. *TWEB*, 3(2), 2009.
- [13] U. Feige. Rigorous analysis of heuristics for np-hard problems. In *SODA*, page 927. SIAM, 2005.
- [14] U. Feige, D. Peleg, and G. Kortsarz. The dense k -subgraph problem. *Algorithmica*, 29(3):410–421, 2001.
- [15] S. Fortunato. Community detection in graphs. *Phys. Rep.*, 486:75–174, 2010.
- [16] G. Gallo, M. D. Grigoriadis, and R. E. Tarjan. A fast parametric maximum flow algorithm and applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 18(1):30–55, 1989.
- [17] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, 1979.
- [18] D. Gibson, R. Kumar, and A. Tomkins. Discovering large dense subgraphs in massive graphs. In K. Böhm, C. S. Jensen, L. M. Haas, M. L. Kersten, P.-Å. Larson, and B. C. Ooi, editors, *VLDB*, pages 721–732. ACM, 2005.
- [19] M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, pages 7821–7826, 2002.
- [20] A. V. Goldberg. Finding a maximum density subgraph. Technical Report UCB/CSD-84-171, EECS Department, University of California, Berkeley, 1984.
- [21] S. Graphs. <http://snap.stanford.edu/data/>.
- [22] M. M. Halldórsson and J. Radhakrishnan. Greed is good: approximating independent sets in sparse and bounded-degree graphs. In F. T. Leighton and M. T. Goodrich, editors, *STOC*, pages 439–448. ACM, 1994.
- [23] J. Håstad. Clique is hard to approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$. In *FOCS*, pages 627–636. IEEE Computer Society, 1996.
- [24] M. Karoński, E. R. Scheinerman, and K. B. Singer-Cohen. On random intersection graphs: The subgraph problem. *Comb. Probab. Comput.*, 8(1-2):131–159, Jan. 1999.
- [25] S. Khot. Ruling out ptas for graph min-bisection, dense k -subgraph, and bipartite clique. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(4):1025–1071, 2006.
- [26] S. Khuller and B. Saha. On finding dense subgraphs. In S. Albers, A. Marchetti-Spaccamela, Y. Matias, S. E. Nikolettseas, and W. Thomas, editors, *ICALP (1)*, volume 5555 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 597–608. Springer, 2009.
- [27] S. Kosub. Local density. In U. Brandes and T. Erlebach, editors, *Network Analysis*, volume 3418 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 112–142. Springer, 2004.
- [28] R. Kumar, P. Raghavan, S. Rajagopalan, and A. Tomkins. Trawling the web for emerging cyber-communities. *Computer Networks*, 31(11-16):1481–1493, 1999.
- [29] V. E. Lee, N. Ruan, R. Jin, and C. Aggarwal. A survey of algorithms for dense subgraph discovery. In C. C. Aggarwal, H. Wang, and A. K. Elmagarmid, editors, *Managing and Mining Graph Data*, volume 40 of *The Kluwer International Series on Advances in Database Systems*, pages 303–336. Springer US, 2010.
- [30] G. Liu and L. Wong. Effective pruning techniques for mining quasi-cliques. In W. Daelemans, B. Goethals, and K. Morik, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, volume 5212 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 33–49. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2008.
- [31] C. Lund and M. Yannakakis. On the hardness of approximating minimization problems. *J. ACM*, 41:960–981, September 1994.
- [32] R. Motwani and P. Raghavan. *Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [33] M. Newman. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Review*, 45(2):167–256, 2003.
- [34] S. B. Seidman. Network structure and minimum degree. *Social Networks*, 5(3):269 – 287, 1983.
- [35] P. Turán. On an extremal problem in graph theory. *Math. Fiz. Lapok*, 48:436–452, 1941.
- [36] N. Wang, S. Parthasarathy, K.-L. Tan, and A. K. H. Tung. Csv: visualizing and mining cohesive subgraphs. In J. T.-L. Wang, editor, *SIGMOD Conference*, pages 445–458. ACM, 2008.
- [37] N. Wang, J. Zhang, K.-L. Tan, and A. K. H. Tung. On triangulation-based dense neighborhood graphs discovery. *PVLDB*, 4(2):58–68, 2010.
- [38] Z. Zeng, J. Wang, L. Zhou, and G. Karypis. Out-of-core coherent closed quasi-clique mining from large dense graph databases. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 32(2):13, 2007.

#	Type	Graph Name	# nodes	# edges	$ E / V $
1.	AutonomousSystemGraphs	as-caida20071112	26389	105722	4,0062905
2.	AutonomousSystemGraphs	as-skitter	1696415	22190596	13,08087703
3.	AutonomousSystemGraphs	as20000102	6474	25144	3,883843065
4.	AutonomousSystemGraphs	oregon1-010526	11174	46818	4,189905137
5.	AutonomousSystemGraphs	oregon2-010526	11461	65460	5,711543495
6.	CitationNetworks	cit-HepPh	34546	841754	24,36617843
7.	CitationNetworks	cit-HepTh	27770	704570	25,37162405
8.	CitationNetworks	cit-Patents	3774768	33037894	8,75229789
9.	CollaborationNetworks	ca-CondMat	23133	186878	8,078416116
10.	CollaborationNetworks	ca-GrQc	5242	28968	5,526135063
11.	CollaborationNetworks	ca-HepPh	12008	236978	19,73500999
12.	CollaborationNetworks	ca-HepTh	9877	51946	5,259289258
13.	CommunicationNetwork	Email-Enron	36692	367662	10,0202239
14.	InternetPeerToPeer	p2p-Gnutella31	62586	295784	4,726040968
15.	ProductCo-Purchasing	amazon0601	403394	4886816	12,11425058
16.	RoadNetworks	roadNet-CA	1965206	5533214	2,815589816
17.	RoadNetworks	roadNet-PA	1088092	3083796	2,834131673
18.	RoadNetworks	roadNet-TX	1379917	3843320	2,785182007
19.	SignedNetworksP1	soc-sign-Slashdot090221	82140	1000962	12,18604821
20.	SignedNetworksP1	wiki-Talk	2394385	9319130	3,892076671
21.	SocialNetwork	soc-Epinions1	75879	811480	10,69439502
22.	SocialNetwork	soc-Slashdot0902	82168	1008460	12,2731477
23.	WebGraphs	web-BerkStan	685230	13298940	19,4079944
24.	WebGraphs	web-Google	875713	8644102	9,870930316
25.	WebGraphs	web-Stanford	281903	3985272	14,13703295

Table 3: List of 25 graphs test from Stanford Large Network Dataset Collection with number of nodes, number of edges and ratio $|E|/|V|$.

#	Graph Name	# nodes	density	av. degree	precision	recall	F-measure	Num. Embedded
1.	as-caida20071112	5	1	4	0,928571429	0,99047619	0,958525346	105
2.	as-skitter	14	1	13	0,998351195	0,999587288	0,99896886	2423
3.	as20000102	5	1	4	0,961538462	1	0,980392157	25
4.	oregon1-010526	5	1	4	0,843137255	0,977272727	0,905263158	44
5.	oregon2-010526	6	1	5	0,791666667	1	0,88372093	38
6.	cit-HepPh	25	1	24	1	1	1	27
7.	cit-HepTh	26	1	25	1	1	1	21
8.	cit-Patents	9	1	8	1	1	1	8388
9.	ca-CondMat	9	1	8	0,739130435	1	0,85	51
10.	ca-GrQc	6	1	5	1	1	1	17
11.	ca-HepPh	20	1	19	1	1	1	12
12.	ca-HepTh	6	1	5	0,914285714	1	0,955223881	32
13.	Email-Enron	11	1	10	0,942857143	1	0,970588235	66
14.	p2p-Gnutella31	5	1	4	1	1	1	250
15.	amazon0601	13	1	12	1	1	1	620
16.	roadNet-CA	4	1	3	0,974968112	0,933516525	0,953792162	13101
17.	roadNet-PA	4	1	3	0,976884422	0,938094582	0,957096638	7253
18.	roadNet-TX	4	1	3	0,982360923	0,944450484	0,963032755	9199
19.	soc-sign-Slashdot090221	13	1	12	0,992063492	0,992063492	0,992063492	126
20.	wiki-Talk	4	1	34	0,954465429	0,996324451	0,974945845	11971
21.	soc-Epinions1	11	1	10	1	1	1	137
22.	soc-Slashdot0902	14	1	13	1	1	1	117
23.	web-BerkStan	20	1	19	0,994186047	0,998540146	0,996358339	685
24.	web-Google	10	1	9	0,904260915	0,981724729	0,941401972	1751
25.	web-Stanford	15	1	14	0,958656331	0,989333333	0,973753281	375

Table 4: Experiments with embedding of communities of radius 1, 100% dense of average degree about $|E|/|V|$. We report the size of the communities embedded, the recall precision and f-measure of our algorithm.

#	Graph Name	# nodes	density	av. degree	precision	recall	F-measure	Num. Embedded
1.	as-caida20071112	7	0,7	5	0,905405405	0,893333333	0,899328859	75
2.	as-skitter	20	0,7	14	0,940600522	0,849646226	0,892812887	1696
3.	as20000102	7	0,7	5	0,857142857	1	0,923076923	18
4.	oregon1-010526	7	0,7	5	0,783783784	0,935483871	0,852941176	31
5.	oregon2-010526	8	0,7	6	0,631578947	0,857142857	0,727272727	28
6.	cit-HepPh	35	0,7	25	1	0,947368421	0,972972973	19
7.	cit-HepTh	37	0,7	26	0,8	0,533333333	0,64	15
8.	cit-Patents	12	0,7	9	0,972490988	0,814814815	0,886697803	6291
9.	ca-CondMat	12	0,7	9	0,444444444	0,736842105	0,554455446	38
10.	ca-GrQc	8	0,7	6	0,866666667	1	0,928571429	13
11.	ca-HepPh	28	0,7	20	0,3	0,375	0,333333333	8
12.	ca-HepTh	8	0,7	6	0,75	1	0,857142857	24
13.	Email-Enron	15	0,7	11	0,612903226	0,791666667	0,690909091	48
14.	p2p-Gnutella31	7	0,7	5	1	0,786516854	0,880503145	178
15.	amazon0601	18	0,7	13	0,965517241	1	0,98245614	448
16.	roadNet-CA	4	0,7	3	1	0,984225524	0,992050059	9826
17.	roadNet-PA	4	0,7	3	1	0,984375	0,992125984	5440
18.	roadNet-TX	4	0,7	3	0,999705623	0,984490506	0,992039728	6899
19.	soc-sign-Slashdot090221	18	0,7	13	0,984848485	0,714285714	0,828025478	91
20.	wiki-Talk	5	0,7	4	0,923212253	0,931502558	0,927338877	9577
21.	soc-Epinions1	15	0,7	11	0,775510204	0,752475248	0,763819095	101
22.	soc-Slashdot0902	20	0,7	14	0,971014493	0,817073171	0,887417219	82
23.	web-BerkStan	28	0,7	20	0,872641509	0,756646217	0,810514786	489
24.	web-Google	14	0,7	10	0,576139089	0,768185452	0,658444673	1251
25.	web-Stanford	21	0,7	15	0,821428571	0,77238806	0,796153846	268

Table 5: Experiments with embedding of communities of radius 1, 70% dense of average degree about $|E|/|V|$. We report the size of the communities embedded, the recall precision and f-measure of our algorithm.

#	Graph Name	# nodes	density	av. degree	precision	recall	F-measure	Num. Embedded
1.	as-caida20071112	7	0,7	5	0,948717949	0,986666667	0,967320261	75
2.	as-skitter	20	0,7	14	0,918563923	0,618514151	0,739252995	1696
3.	as20000102	7	0,7	5	0,947368421	1	0,972972973	18
4.	oregon1-010526	7	0,7	5	0,885714286	1	0,939393939	31
5.	oregon2-010526	8	0,7	6	0,675	0,964285714	0,794117647	28
6.	cit-HepPh	35	0,7	25	1	0,684210526	0,8125	19
7.	cit-HepTh	37	0,7	26	1	0,2	0,333333333	15
8.	cit-Patents	12	0,7	9	0,979404193	0,846606263	0,908176315	6291
9.	ca-CondMat	12	0,7	9	0,421875	0,710526316	0,529411765	38
10.	ca-GrQc	8	0,7	6	0,666666667	0,923076923	0,774193548	13
11.	ca-HepPh	28	0,7	20	0,583333333	0,875	0,7	8
12.	ca-HepTh	8	0,7	6	0,8	1	0,888888889	24
13.	Email-Enron	15	0,7	11	0,634920635	0,833333333	0,720720721	48
14.	p2p-Gnutella31	7	0,7	5	1	0,578651685	0,733096085	178
15.	amazon0601	18	0,7	13	0,991150442	1	0,995555556	448
16.	roadNet-CA	4	0,7	3	0,99922179	0,914716059	0,955103342	9826
17.	roadNet-PA	4	0,7	3	0,999193873	0,911397059	0,953278216	5440
18.	roadNet-TX	4	0,7	3	0,99904943	0,914045514	0,954658996	6899
19.	soc-sign-Slashdot090221	18	0,7	13	0,925925926	0,274725275	0,423728814	91
20.	wiki-Talk	5	0,7	4	0,922119447	0,843165918	0,880877059	9577
21.	soc-Epinions1	15	0,7	11	0,788235294	0,663366337	0,720430108	101
22.	soc-Slashdot0902	20	0,7	14	0,923076923	0,292682927	0,444444444	82
23.	web-BerkStan	28	0,7	20	0,884520885	0,736196319	0,803571429	489
24.	web-Google	14	0,7	10	0,64084507	0,872901679	0,739086294	1251
25.	web-Stanford	21	0,7	15	0,859778598	0,869402985	0,864564007	268

Table 6: Experiments with embedding of communities of radius 2, 70% dense of average degree about $|E|/|V|$. We report the size of the communities embedded, the recall precision and f-measure of our algorithm.

#	Graph Name	# nodes	density	av. degree	precision	recall	F-measure	Num. Embedded
1.	as-caida20071112	10	0,5	5	0,894736842	0,980769231	0,935779817	52
2.	as-skitter	28	0,5	14	0,770140429	0,860445912	0,812792512	1211
3.	as20000102	10	0,5	5	0,8	1	0,888888889	12
4.	oregon1-010526	10	0,5	5	0,846153846	1	0,916666667	22
5.	oregon2-010526	12	0,5	6	0,464285714	0,684210526	0,553191489	19
6.	cit-HepPh	50	0,5	25	1	1	1	13
7.	cit-HepTh	52	0,5	26	0,714285714	0,5	0,588235294	10
8.	cit-Patents	18	0,5	9	0,873723104	0,95851216	0,91415577	4194
9.	ca-CondMat	18	0,5	9	0,46	0,92	0,613333333	25
10.	ca-GrQc	12	0,5	6	0,727272727	1	0,842105263	8
11.	ca-HepPh	40	0,5	20	0,25	0,333333333	0,285714286	6
12.	ca-HepTh	12	0,5	6	0,842105263	1	0,914285714	16
13.	Email-Enron	22	0,5	11	0,5	0,787878788	0,611764706	33
14.	p2p-Gnutella31	10	0,5	5	1	0,696	0,820754717	125
15.	amazon0601	26	0,5	13	0,987261146	1	0,993589744	310
16.	roadNet-CA	6	0,5	3	0,99908383	0,998931298	0,999007558	6550
17.	roadNet-PA	6	0,5	3	0,99917287	0,999448428	0,99931063	3626
18.	roadNet-TX	6	0,5	3	0,999130435	0,999347684	0,999239048	4599
19.	soc-sign-Slashdot090221	26	0,5	13	0,942857143	0,523809524	0,673469388	63
20.	wiki-Talk	8	0,5	4	0,941370768	0,952380952	0,946843854	5985
21.	soc-Epinions1	22	0,5	11	0,776315789	0,867647059	0,819444444	68
22.	soc-Slashdot0902	28	0,5	14	0,962962963	0,448275862	0,611764706	58
23.	web-BerkStan	40	0,5	20	0,62915601	0,719298246	0,671214188	342
24.	web-Google	20	0,5	10	0,374229346	0,693714286	0,48618342	875
25.	web-Stanford	30	0,5	15	0,691542289	0,743315508	0,716494845	187

Table 7: Experiments with embedding of communities of radius 2, 50% dense of average degree about $|E|/|V|$. We report the size of the communities embedded, the recall precision and f-measure of our algorithm.

num.	file name	numarcs	time ph1	time ph2	time ph3	total time	cost per arc
1	as-caida20071112	105722	0.34	0.32	0.34	1	9.46e-06
2	as-skitter	22190596	181.12	373.33	414.16	968.61	4.36e-05
3	as20000102	25144	0.06	0.08	0.1	0.24	9.55e-06
4	oregon1-010526	46818	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.36	7.69e-06
5	oregon2-010526	65460	0.14	0.21	0.23	0.58	8.86e-06
6	cit-HepPh	841754	3.3	3.42	3.31	10.03	1.19e-05
7	cit-HepTh	704570	3.75	3.94	3.88	11.57	1.64e-05
8	cit-Patents	33037894	721.13	786	797.23	2304.36	6.97e-05
9	ca-CondMat	186878	0.46	0.54	0.58	1.58	8.45e-06
10	ca-GrQc	28968	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.21	7.25e-06
11	ca-HepPh	236978	0.3	0.46	0.6	1.36	5.74e-06
12	ca-HepTh	51946	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.52	1.00e-05
13	Email-Enron	367662	1.1	1.57	1.83	4.5	1.22e-05
14	p2p-Gnutella31	295784	1.12	1.22	1.25	3.59	1.21e-05
15	amazon0601	4886816	28.04	28.27	27.37	83.68	1.71e-05
16	roadNet-CA	5533214	107.29	99.73	100.2	307.22	5.55e-05
17	roadNet-PA	3083796	45.23	41.92	43.51	130.66	4.24e-05
18	roadNet-TX	3843320	63.58	59.38	58.61	181.57	4.72e-05
19	soc-sign-Slashdot090221	1000962	3.95	4.37	4.57	12.89	1.29e-05
20	wiki-Talk	9319130	198.96	213.97	165.91	578.84	6.21e-05
21	soc-Epinions1	811480	3.43	4.14	4.67	12.24	1.51e-05
22	soc-Slashdot0902	1008460	3.9	4.7	4.79	13.39	1.33e-05
23	web-BerkStan	13298940	1066.51	2897.22	2890.32	6854.05	5.15e-04
24	web-Google	8644102	61.88	75.49	82.16	219.53	2.54e-05
25	web-Stanford	3985272	91.5	106.75	268.76	467.01	1.17e-04

Table 8: Experiments with embedding of communities of radius 1, 100% density. Timing of phase,1, 2 and 3 and total time (in seconds), and time pr arc.

num.	file name	numarcs	time ph1	time ph2	time ph3	total time	cost per arc
1	as-caida20071112	105722	0.3	0.3	0.33	0.93	8.80e-06
2	as-skitter	22190596	159.25	192.38	203.75	555.38	2.50e-05
3	as20000102	25144	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.18	7.16e-06
4	oregon1-010526	46818	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.34	7.26e-06
5	oregon2-010526	65460	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.45	6.87e-06
6	cit-HepPh	841754	2.08	2.42	2.45	6.95	8.26e-06
7	cit-HepTh	704570	1.84	2.07	2.53	6.44	9.14e-06
8	cit-Patents	33037894	702.65	765.72	786.36	2254.73	6.82e-05
9	ca-CondMat	186878	0.4	0.4	0.44	1.24	6.64e-06
10	ca-GrQc	28968	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.18	6.21e-06
11	ca-HepPh	236978	0.29	0.25	0.27	0.81	3.42e-06
12	ca-HepTh	51946	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.43	8.28e-06
13	Email-Enron	367662	0.84	0.92	0.98	2.74	7.45e-06
14	p2p-Gnutella31	295784	1.08	1.17	1.22	3.47	1.17e-05
15	amazon0601	4886816	23.04	23.04	22.56	68.64	1.40e-05
16	roadNet-CA	5533214	103.42	100.03	99.82	303.27	5.48e-05
17	roadNet-PA	3083796	45.93	43.61	44.2	133.74	4.34e-05
18	roadNet-TX	3843320	60.25	57.78	58.66	176.69	4.60e-05
19	oc-sign-Slashdot090221	1000962	3.4	4.11	4.23	11.74	1.17e-05
20	wiki-Talk	9319130	128.42	142.71	154.92	426.05	4.57e-05
21	soc-Epinions1	811480	2.31	2.81	3.37	8.49	1.05e-05
22	soc-Slashdot0902	1008460	3.32	3.88	3.96	11.16	1.11e-05
23	web-BerkStan	13298940	65.43	103.16	99.81	268.4	2.02e-05
24	web-Google	8644102	56.76	53.59	54.02	164.37	1.90e-05
25	web-Stanford	3985272	43.93	47.11	60.47	151.51	3.80e-05

Table 9: Experiments with embedding of communities of radius 1, 70% density. Timing of phase,1, 2 and 3, total time (in seconds), and time per arc.

num.	file name	numarcs	time ph1	time ph2	time ph3	total time	cost per arc
1	as-caida20071112	105722	2.94	18.64	20.17	41.75	3.95e-04
2	as-skitter	22190596	10902.6	19621.01	25241.08	55764.69	2.51e-03
3	as20000102	25144	0.51	1.83	1.49	3.83	1.52e-04
4	oregon1-010526	46818	0.96	3.62	1.87	6.45	1.38e-04
5	oregon2-010526	65460	1.08	3.24	2.78	7.1	1.08e-04
6	cit-HepPh	841754	68.42	88.93	89.38	246.73	2.93e-04
7	cit-HepTh	704570	68.98	161.12	170.39	400.49	5.68e-04
8	cit-Patents	33037894	1796	2077.75	2150.96	6024.71	1.82e-04
9	ca-CondMat	186878	5.53	6.72	7.02	19.27	1.03e-04
10	ca-GrQc	28968	0.48	0.75	0.76	1.99	6.87e-05
11	ca-HepPh	236978	3.26	9.68	11.01	23.95	1.01e-04
12	ca-HepTh	51946	1.44	1.78	1.75	4.97	9.57e-05
13	Email-Enron	367662	13.42	23.38	40.11	76.91	2.09e-04
14	p2p-Gnutella31	295784	9.48	9.6	9.62	28.7	9.70e-05
15	amazon0601	4886816	322.33	317.33	310.45	950.11	1.94e-04
16	roadNet-CA	5533214	237.53	234.08	227.45	699.06	1.26e-04
17	roadNet-PA	3083796	120.03	117.52	115.2	352.75	1.14e-04
18	roadNet-TX	3843320	152.14	149.46	145.01	446.61	1.16e-04
19	soc-sign-Slashdot090221	1000962	359.46	418.74	428.14	1206.34	1.21e-03
20	wiki-Talk	9319130	14539.25	15883.42	6385.09	36807.76	3.95e-03
21	soc-Epinions1	811480	169.48	233.11	250.23	652.82	8.04e-04
22	soc-Slashdot0902	1008460	375.55	424.08	429.07	1228.7	1.22e-03
23	web-BerkStan	13298940	10322.09	21415.46	15577.4	47314.95	3.56e-03
24	web-Google	8644102	241.02	445.79	510.39	1197.2	1.38e-04
25	web-Stanford	3985272	2122.91	3970.01	3123.08	9216	2.31e-03

Table 10: Experiments with embedding of communities of radius 2, 70%. Timing of phase,1, 2 and 3 and total time (in seconds), and time per arc.

num.	file name	numarcs	time ph1	time ph2	time ph3	total time	cost per arc
1	as-caida20071112	105722	2.11	7.06	5.77	14.94	1.41e-04
2	as-skitter	22190596	2212	4198.62	5365.61	11776.23	5.31e-04
3	as20000102	25144	0.44	0.57	0.6	1.61	6.40e-05
4	oregon1-010526	46818	0.74	1.28	1.29	3.31	7.07e-05
5	oregon2-010526	65460	0.82	1.25	1.31	3.38	5.16e-05
6	cit-HepPh	841754	44.63	73.97	72.63	191.23	2.27e-04
7	cit-HepTh	704570	35.52	83.87	124.16	243.55	3.46e-04
8	cit-Patents	33037894	1426.51	1564.77	1584.58	4575.86	1.39e-04
9	ca-CondMat	186878	4.57	5.43	5.78	15.78	8.44e-05
10	ca-GrQc	28968	0.39	0.56	0.59	1.54	5.32e-05
11	ca-HepPh	236978	1.85	3.78	4.06	9.69	4.09e-05
12	ca-HepTh	51946	1.13	1.4	1.42	3.95	7.60e-05
13	Email-Enron	367662	8.48	13.71	29.75	51.94	1.41e-04
14	p2p-Gnutella31	295784	8.2	8.6	8.63	25.43	8.60e-05
15	amazon0601	4886816	263.66	283.89	272.97	820.52	1.68e-04
16	roadNet-CA	5533214	200.26	196.21	191.29	587.76	1.06e-04
17	roadNet-PA	3083796	99.3	97.69	93.52	290.51	9.42e-05
18	roadNet-TX	3843320	125.83	124.1	120.3	370.23	9.63e-05
19	oc-sign-Slashdot090221	1000962	339.9	404.43	408.17	1152.5	1.15e-03
20	wiki-Talk	9319130	14793.02	15704.76	6636.37	37134.15	3.98e-03
21	soc-Epinions1	811480	93.41	158.88	261.85	514.14	6.34e-04
22	soc-Slashdot0902	1008460	341.68	404.75	412.42	1158.85	1.15e-03
23	web-BerkStan	13298940	5382.16	5311.22	5286.71	15980.09	1.20e-03
24	web-Google	8644102	177.88	223.74	250.02	651.64	7.54e-05
25	web-Stanford	3985272	1133.52	1859.58	1889.28	4882.38	1.23e-03

Table 11: Experiments with embedding of communities of radius 2, 50%. Timing of phase,1, 2 and 3 and total time (in seconds) and time per arc.